



is at length that, based upon the ground taken by the church Anti-Slavery Society in the third article of its Declaration of Principle, viz. THE SYSTEM OF AMERICAN SLAVERY AND THE PRACTICE OF SLAVERYHOLDING ESSENTIALLY SINFUL AND ANTI-CHRISTIAN, AND TO BE DEALT WITH, THEREFORE, AS SUCH BY CHRISTIAN CHURCHES AND MINISTERS.

Henceforth the New York Independent is to be regarded as holding *in fact* on the English side of the water, that no church is worthy to be recognized as a church of Christ, which does not regard the sinful and anti-christian practice of slaveryholding as a sin to be dealt with by the discipline of the church. Let it be noted as *an era* in the moral war with slavery, that the distinguishing principle of christian abolitionism should now be *enforced* by the New York Independent, although a few months ago it could not oblige the "Principle" by entering into that wordy warfare which marked the recent school of abolitionists."

The "wonder warfare" will be necessary, now that the Independent itself and that school of christian abolitionists are together upon the platform of the Church Anti-Slavery Society, until now, ignored, viz. THE SYSTEM OF AMERICAN SLAVERY AND THE PRACTICE OF SLAVERYHOLDING ESSENTIALLY SINFUL AND ANTI-CHRISTIAN, AND TO BE DEALT WITH, THEREFORE, AS SUCH BY CHRISTIAN CHURCHES AND MINISTERS.

When they, anti-slavery Christians, awoke to the conviction that slavery ought to be abolished, they soon perceived, also, the difficulty of carrying that conviction into immediate practical effect. So, instead of affirming the simple and plain principle of non-resistance, they were obliged to state that they spoke in carefully measured phrases, dwelt on exceptions, and put their principles, in practice, to the test. They said, "we do not mean, and give it at least the quasi sanction of the church indefinitely. The history of the churches in this country show that individual churches have freed themselves from the sin by a plain simple condemnation of slavery practically enforced. But if any church or denomination has rid itself of slavery by dwelling on exceptions or leaving room for innocent exceptions, they will soon learn the fact. The true way is to proclaim the true principle and then, in due time, persevere to bring men to it, rather than to fester all future progress with a rule made up of exceptions." *Maine Evangelist, July 26, 1860.*

#### A TRANSIENT PARTY.

A party, to have a permanent existence, must be based on, or devoted to, a principle which in its ultimate, if not its present manifestation, is in itself immortal and enduring in its nature. Human nature never anchors itself permanently where. Absolute right or wrong alone, makes permanent decisions, and forms the basis of parties. Now "Squatter Sovereignty" has no such quality, and by no possibility can become the basis of a permanent party.

It will not be denied nor disputed that the only significance belonging to Squatter Sovereignty, as it relates to the Douglas party, is in connection with slaves and slavery. The vote they may give to the people in or out of slavery, is the only case in which it is in the line of the only question in which it is used by the Douglas party. Such being the case, it is but a simple process to show that the idea lacks all basis, and must be exceedingly fleeting and evanescent in its nature. Thus, negroes are the subject of this Squatter Sovereignty principle, are either men or they are not. This cannot be disputed. If they are men, then certainly it cannot be a principle that their personal rights are subject to the will of the majority. All men, says the Declaration of Independence, have certain inalienable and inalienable rights, among which are *life, liberty, &c.* This principle is the very basis of all democracy, and our Republic, or republicanism, is founded upon it, and is destroyed. Then if the negroes are men, it is quite plain that the doctrine which denies them inherent rights, and makes their life and liberty to depend on the interest of other persons, the delirium of the majority, and the caprice of the do-or-die of our government, lacks dignity, and no party can rise to success on it, except as it overthrows the government in its rise.

On the other hand, if the negroes are not men, then certainly the doctrine of Squatter Sovereignty is unfounded and mischievous, for when was the ownership of horses, cattle, wagons, plows, or any other property, made the subject of a town caucus or a popular vote. They are men or property—nothing is more certain. There is no medium ground they can occupy. The plea that they may hold the relation of children, or wards, does not touch the difficulty, and is a mere subterfuge; for the reason that the condition in which the people in issue, have no right of relationship in such a party. It is a distinction, and a distinction of equal relation, as pointed out on earth by noting both itself and must be considered by itself. Then we say, they are men or property, and we respectfully ask any Douglas man, to make a distinction in understanding himself, leaving any person else understand, the full scope and intent of the doctrine of Squatter Sovereignty, to tell us on what principle it can be applied to either of these conditions. Let us make a distinction in understanding, if they are men, as their life and liberty properly the subjects of the

popular vote? if they are property, are they properly the subjects of a popular vote? They are direct and plain, and we presume will not be answered with equal directness.

We place this thing in what appears to us a clear and unmistakable light, so that the Douglas party has a substantial foundation. A colony founded on an iceberg, making its way rapidly to the sea of the world, would be no more certain of speedily finding itself, than would any visionless mass of support, than will the Douglas party after this election is over. It is founded on a fallacy, and the fallacy is the right and the wrong of the world, to lack the strength of *evil*, or the vitality and endurance of good; and after a meteor light fade, must disappear. Douglas is not the first man who lashed the angry Hellespont, and then, in the peace, not to be angry with him, planned his chair in the storm, telling the waves that they were to go farther. Nor, indeed, is he the first who has had his foolish adherents condemn his "pluck," and flatter him that his voice will prove potent to still the waves and stay the tide. He may be the last, though we will most certainly add our to the catalogue of examples of the vanity and foolish impotency of all such efforts.—*Wm. Free Press*

The argument of the Free Democrat is a conclusive one. The Douglas party must be a transient party for the reasons above stated. But did it never occur to the editor who wrote it, that the Republican, or Lincoln party, can never be a permanent party, for the same reason? The entire article needs little more than the change of a few words, to make it as conclusive in the latter case as in the former. "Non-extension" equally with "Squatter Sovereignty" is destitute of the conditions of permanency laid down by the Free Democrat. The Douglas party hinges upon the incident of "voting slavery up or down," in a given region of country. The Lincoln party upon the incident of voting slavery in or out of a given region of country, both parties agreeing that in certain other regions, slavery may be voted both up and in.

Let the reader test this by reading over the above argument again, but substituting "Non-extension," for "Squatter Sovereignty" and "Lincoln" for "Douglas." For "negroes" substitute "slaves." For "town caucuses" put "State Legislatures." For "the will of the majority," put "the place of their location," &c.

Then ask yourself whether the argument is, not as good against the permanency of the Republican party, (whether victorious or otherwise, in 1860) as it is against the permanency of the Douglas Democracy. If not, why not?

The foundation fallacy of the Republican and Douglas Democratic parties, is, in substance, one and the same. Both admit a "State Sovereignty" that can "vote slavery up or down," in or out. Both accordingly admit that a "Sov origin State" may decide whether a certain portion of its inhabitants by holding another certain portion of them as *chattel*, can deprive them of Federal citizenship, and obligate the Federal Government to dispense with their services as Federal citizens, and to withhold from them Federal protection. Both the parties, alike, pledge themselves to recognize and protect this right of the majority in a "Sov origin State," to vote the minority to be slaves, and out of the protection of the Federal Government.

"Negroes who are the subjects of this State Sovereignty" principle, are either men or they are not. This cannot be disputed. If they are men, then, certainly, it cannot be a principle that their personal rights are subject to the will of the majority, &c., &c., precisely as the Free Democrat says of the negroes in the Territories. Hence "It cannot be a principle" that there is any such "State Sovereignty" to be recognized, or that the Federal Government can be involved, by any exercise of "State Sovereignty," from its constitutional obligation to protect as citizens, all its native born inhabitants alike, as the Constitution in its very first paragraph *announces* its grand object to be "to establish justice, and secure the blessings of liberty to all the people of the United States, and their posterity. All this, however, the Republican party equally with the Douglas Democracy, ignores, even pledging itself that, in its exercise of Federal power, it will not interfere for the protection of its citizens, with the State Sovereignty in such cases. But, in the language of the Free Democrat, "Absolute right or wrong shall alone make permanent law, and forms the basis of parties. Hence neither of these parties can be permanent."

We have shown wherein the Republican party and the Douglas Democracy agree. We now inquire wherein do they disagree?

The Douglas Democracy, holding as we have shown, that "absolute right and wrong" may be established by "State Sovereignty," and that slavery in the States may be voted up or down at pleasure, (and having been, and still being kept in existence by the assent of the National Congress, to this end, is encouraged to go one step further, and to claim that those who, as agreed by common consent, may hold slaves in the States, may hold them in the Territories, as well—that, as slavery may be voted up or down in the States, so it may be voted up or down in the Territories. If the Federal Government cannot remove Federal citizens, nor determine who are Federal citizens in the States, and in the Territories, who people the Constitution was formed, the Douglas Democrats do not see how the Federal Government can determine who are Federal citizens in the Territories. They offer that if the Federal Government cannot remove Federal citizens, and secure the blessings of liberty for the people of the United States, it has abandoned and established it for every purpose, they cannot do more for the people of the Territories, outside of the States, who have not yet come into the Union.

Just here the Republicans part company with them. They are willing to construe the Constitution that it cannot establish justice, and secure the blessings of liberty to the people of the United States, of whom, they themselves, constitute a part. But they insist that the Federal Government has power to do for the people of the Territories what they admit it cannot do for the people of the States. And they base their claim wholly upon a provision of the Constitution, that "Congress shall have power to dispose of, and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the Territory, or other property belonging to the United States."

Is this building a party, to have a permanent existence, based on, and devoted to a principle, which is "fundamental and enduring in its nature?" Can "humanity anchor permanently" there? Will a party secure liberty for new Territories, that cannot secure it for the original States, for whose benefit the Government was established, and by which it must be administered? Will a nation, a Government, or a people, that cannot secure its own liberties at home, secure the liberties of its dependencies, abroad? And this, too, in the prospect that the Territory is soon to become an integral part of the nation, a State of the Union, which would deprive the majority of its liberty to be withdrawn? Is this building a party for permanency on "the basis of absolute right?"

The Republican party, as we have shown, is based upon the same grand premises as the Douglas Democracy, namely, the "State Sovereignty" of transforming *slaves into property*. It has only to draw logical conclusions from those premises, as does the Douglas Democracy, in order to arrive at similar results. The process is rapidly going on, already. Two years ago, as intelligent Republicans confessed to us, that his own mind, and the minds of his political associates, were undergoing a great change on that subject, and that the views of Mr. Douglas were gaining ground among Republicans. The Republican vote in Congress, on the Crittenden Leecompton bill, was an almost, or quite unanimous relinquishment of their principles, for the time being, a fact which Mr. Douglas and his partisans, are now using effectively against them. The numerous local coalitions between Republicans and Douglas Democrats, soon after, in the elections of members of Congress, gave evidence of a disposition to make the compromise permanent. So did the N. Y. Tribune's advocacy of a Republican acceptance of Douglas as candidate for U. S. Senator in Illinois, in preference to running Lincoln against him. Had the advice been followed, the advocacy of Douglas as the Republican candidate for the Presidency, instead of such candidate would probably have been the next move. In consequence, the Republicans kept their ranks together, only by rejecting a Squatter Sovereignty Platform, on which to carry their State election. The recent Republican vote in Congress, on Eli Taylor's movement, shows that the members voting, were nearly equally divided on the "Squatter Sovereignty" question, and that above one third of the whole number did not vote at all, leaving less than one third of the whole number who stood firm against the "Squatter Sovereignty" doctrine. It is strongest form, the Chicago platform, carefully studied, reveals the fact, that it contains no definite pledge to carry out the principle of Congressional intervention, a fact noticed by politicians of











## CAUSES AND CURE OF POVERTY

## CHAPTE

## A MAN OBJECT OF EX. 100

Consideration. Duration of character. *Yousness* and *perseverance* have already been mentioned as essential to success in life, and the absence or opposite of them have been shown to be among the chief causes of Poverty, delinquency and want.

But consideration, decision, resolution, and perseverance.  
I suppose success can be attained by the exercise of

What, then, is the *supererogatory* for a man to have in view, to motivate him to the proper exercise of his powers?

The reader will perhaps wonder at this question, in this place. As the writer is treating of poverty, its causes, and its cure it will perhaps be taken for granted that the accumulation of poverty, or, at least, the avoidance of poverty, constitutes the main subject. But I think that a man needs to have in view, in order to stimulate and sustain the exerting required

[illegible]

Did you ever consider the life of a savage, and inquire why it is, that savages never acquire property, to any extent, nor rise to civilized life?

The reason is simply this. The *object and aim* of the savage is in only the present supply of his immediate necessities, as a mere animal being, the satisfying of his hunger, a covering and a shelter from the cold. Beyond this he has no object, no aim. Look at the Indian of the western forest. Enter his wigwag; notice his habits, and study his character. See how he kills away his time, and sleeps and lounges about, till hunger rouses him to the chase. Notice his agility, skill, and vigor, till his supply of game is procured. Then see him settle down again in listlessness and languor, till hunger again rouses him to activity. Aside from hunting and fishing, as his present necessities compel him, he does little more than to construct his bow and arrow, his implements for fishing, his preparation of a rude blanket and such like. His artifice are rises no higher than the preparation of a temporary wigwag. His knowledge and possession of agriculture terminate in the planting of little patches of corn, potatoes, and tobacco, without the help of the plow.

What is the philosophy of all this?

The Indian here *learns* to aim at the highest object than she supply of his actual physical necessities. His wants are rational, thinking, moral being, have never been taken into the account, nor provided for, in his economy of human life. — so that the mere *dream of poverty*, or in other words, as they say, the fear of hunger, nakedness, cold, and want of shelter, have formed the only motive of his action. He is never *free* from a state of poverty, because he never *is* free from it. He looks to nothing *beyond* the satisfaction of his needs, except for pain, the preservation of

To be, you think, a national desire  
 To rise above the poverty of the savage, you  
 must have higher and nobler aims than the savage. To  
 avoid poverty you must have more higher aims in view  
 than merely to escape poverty. You must aim at education,  
 knowledge, usefulness, society, social improvement,  
 social progress, and so on. For unless you will a better  
 life for the condition of the savage. In some respects  
 if you live in a civilized country you will be in danger  
 of being below the *For Savage life* in the woods, and

is probably the dominating factor in determining the actuality and intensity of suffering. The animals that have the least favorable conditions—those that are least healthy and destitute in our efforts to control who, what, and degrading dependence. Yet, actually, and destitute will be found, wherever the terms and degree of their rise is higher than the mere supply of physical wants—no higher than the dread of hunger, the fear of starvation, the necessity of sustaining animal life.

Look among the poor of New York city, and see if it is not so. Enter the dwellings of the miserably poor and find the same. Exceptions to the general fact will be found, but the great majority of cases will illustrate our argument. The *omnivorousness of life*, among them, are, and have been no higher than those of the western savage, the supply of the wants, and the gratification of the appetite of the man, as a mere animal. In this latter particular, the chief difference consists in the Indian, except in his use of tobacco, and of the white man's whiskey, needs only the supply of his *natural wants*. The city savage adds to this, the desire to indulge in the various gratifications and amusements that he finds within his reach. The poverty and misery at the Five Points, need no further explanation than this. Man has aspired to no destiny higher than that of a mere animal, a brute. And therefore he has sunk beneath it. God never intended that man should escape poverty and destitution, unless he *aspir'd* at something higher, and *lifter* than merely to escape it.

Extend, now, your observation to a large class of our city population that ought not to be classed, exactly, with the inhabitants of the Five Points, though some of them may be tending thitherward. Do the the masses of our day laborers and journeymen mechanics *aim* at any higher object than the present supply of their physical wants whether natural or artificial?

If not, wherein does their philosophy of life rise higher than that of the savage? And where? do the results differ? The savage hunts, till he gets a supply of venison, and then lies still till he wants more. The day laborer works when hungry or the immediate fear of it presses him, then lounges in the dram-shop, smokes cigars, and runs riot, till necessity again drives him to labor. The journeyman mechanic, while there is a demand for his work, or when he does not prefer idleness, runs riot in luxuries, goes to the theatre, and squanders his money. And whenever employ fails him, either through his own fault or otherwise, he is distressed for want of bread for his family, while a little fore-sight and economy might have placed him above want. And all because he had no higher aim than to eat, drink, and be merry, and never had any higher aim in life than mere animal enjoyment. He meant to secure this aim, at nothing more, full short of it.

## LIFE WITHOUT LOVE

We sometimes meet with men who seem to lack that any indulgence in an affectionate feeling is a weakness. They will return from a journey and greet their families with a distant dignity, and stand among their children with the cold and lofty splendor of an iceberg surrounded by its broken fragments. There is hardly a more unnatural sight in the world than one of these families without a heart. A father here who cannot catch a boy's eyes than take away his heart. Who has experienced the joys of friendship, and values sympathy and affection, would not rather lose all that is beautiful in nature's scenery than be robbed of the human treasures of his heart? I cherish, thus, your heart, best of fellows. Indulge in the war and gushing of these affections. Indulge in fraternal love.

## LOOK UP:

A young man once picked up a five-dollar bill on the street. Ever afterwards, as he walked along, he kept his eyes fixed steadily on the ground, in hopes of finding another. And the course of a long time he did pick up a gold dollar, a five, a goodly number of coins, gold and silver. But all these years, while he was looking for them, he saw nothing of the heavens very bright above him, and nature's beauties all around him. He never once allowed his eyes to look up from the ground. At last, when he was eighty years old, he died, a rich man, but hardly any the wiser. He had seen a better road in which to walk, but he never took it.

A great man is always willing to be little. While he is in the position of advantage, he goes to sleep. When he is pushed, disappointed, irritated, defeated, he has a chance to learn something; he has been put on his guard. He has gained fear; he learns his ignorance; he is cured of his vanity of speech; he has moderation and real skill. The wise man always throws himself on the side of the weak. It is more to his interest than it is to the strong. His weak point, the wound, disintegrates and falls off him like a dead skin, and when they would triumph, he has passed on invulnerable. As long as I stand against you, I feel a certain assurance of success. But when as honeyed words of praise are spoken for me, I know that I am unprotected before my enemies.—E.

THE TRUE BLUE.—Everybody has heard the designation "true blue," applied to Presbyterians. Rev. Dr. Murray, in his speech before the assembly of the Free Church of Scotland, at the tri-centenary celebration, thus plays upon the word, to its origin.

"I have often been asked why we are called 'true blue.' I did not know how to answer. But I asked a Scotchman. 'Well,' said he, 'when we were persecuted the missionaries used to go to the mountains, when they were going to have a communion they held a blue flag, which was an invitation to the people of the country around to attend and their descendants are called true blue from that.' That was our explanation, but I have found out another for myself. A few years ago I was in Naples and Rome, and went to Pompeii, where I spent some time among its splendid ruins of variegated blues. All the other colors had faded away but the blue was as bright as the day it was put although it had been buried for nearly two thousand years. The true blue never goes out—that is the meaning of it [laughter]. True blue Presbyterianism is so blue that never gives out."

We could wish that there were more true hibernationists, temperance men, and christians, if this latter be the true meaning of the phrase.

Sidney Smith once said in an aristocratic party, that man, to know how bad he is, must become poor; to know how bad other people are, he must become rich. Many man thinks it is virtue that keeps him from turning race when it is only a full stomach. One should be careful not mistake potatoes for principles.<sup>1</sup>

It is more glorious to *bear* misfortunes with patience,  
to desire death to avoid them.

Let friendship creep gently to a height. If it rush  
it may soon run itself out of breath.

## WRITINGS OF WILLIAM GOODELL

For sale at the office of the *Principia* -  
DEMOCRACY OF CHRISTIANITY, 2 Vols., \$1 50..  
SLAVERY AND ANTI-SLAVERY (History of) 1 Vol., \$1 00  
AMERICAN SLAVE TRADE, 1 V 4, \$0 75 .

FOR THE MILLIONS.

- I. The Federal Constitution of 1787-9.
- II. The Articles of Confederation, 1778.
- III. The Declaration of Independence, 1776.
- IV. The Articles of Association, 1774.

With notes showing their bearing on slavery, and the power of the State and National Governments. 52 pp.

A specimen of *Lepidoptera*, collected from the highest altitude, prefix to the word "N. AFRICA" contains extracts from State of New York, On the 10th day of July, 1867, Northwest Territory, also sent to the Rev.

For sale, by William B. Williams, at the  
 residence of the author, 1111 Broadway, New York.  
 Price, \$1.00 per copy, by mail, 75 cents; at the  
 residence of the author, 1111 Broadway, New York.  
 For sale, by William B. Williams, at the  
 residence of the author, 1111 Broadway, New York.  
 Price, \$1.00 per copy, by mail, 75 cents; at the  
 residence of the author, 1111 Broadway, New York.

22 We have a book on the subject of the  
order for any other.

## THE ANALYST.

A WEEKLY LITERARY PAPER DEVOTED TO THE IMPROVEMENT OF THE RACE.  
 Social Improvement published by M. R. ALLARD.  
 Street, Cleveland, O. — Send for Specimens